

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 25, 2005 has been carefully considered.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cheung et al. ("Cheung," U.S. pat. no. 5,812,531) in view of Ritter et al. ("Ritter," U.S. pat. no. 5,570,084).

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to specify that the transferred information includes

session parameters relating to communication sessions between the wireless device and the wireless network such that disruption of communication between the wireless device and the wireless network during a turnover of communication with the wireless device from the first access point to the second access point is minimized

This feature is not disclosed in Cheung. Cheung is concerned with in effect establishing a one-to-one correspondence between access points and wireless nodes. This is accomplished by a registration process whose details include having transmitting nodes (access points and wireless nodes) transmit periodic signals such that a topology map can be constructed showing which wireless devices are accessible to which access points. When this is determined, the wireless nodes are each assigned an access point—that is, registered with said access point. As stated above, this assignment or registration is a one-to-one correspondence process.

In contrast, the presently claimed invention relates to a turnover of communication between a wireless device and a wireless network from one access point to a second access point. In order to avoid communication disruption during the turnover, session information about the wireless device is distributed to the second access point since the two access points have overlapping coverage areas and the migration of the wireless device from the coverage area of the first access point to that of the second access point is deemed in advance to be likely. As explained in the specification,¹ such session information may include for example reauthorization information and other information required to establish contact with the second access point. In comparison to the one-to one correspondence between the wireless node and access point in Cheung, the claimed invention in effect establishes a one-to-many correspondence between a wireless device and access points having overlapping coverage areas. By taking great pains to thus associate a single access point with each wireless node in any situation, as opposed to multiple access points when coverage areas overlap, Cheung arguably teaches away from the invention as claimed.

The Office Action equates Cheung's AP's sending of a multicast message to inform all other APs that the sending network node was registered to itself with Claims 1 and 2's "transferring information associated with the wireless device to the second access point." In order to overcome this confusion, Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to better define the nature

¹ See for example paragraphs [0005] – [0007].

of the information sent, and thereby more clearly distinguish this information from that sent in Cheung. Given the different aims of Cheung and the presently claimed invention, and Ritter's failure to meaningfully contribute to overcoming this deficiency of Cheung, it is respectfully maintained that such a distinction is unobvious in view of any teaching in Cheung and Ritter, considered singularly or in combination, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Cheung in view of Ritter should be withdrawn.

Conclusion


In view of the preceding discussion, Applicants respectfully urge that the claims of the present application define patentable subject matter and should be passed to allowance. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone call would help advance prosecution of the present invention, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Please charge any additional required fee, including those necessary to obtain extensions of time to render timely the filing of the instant Reply, or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited, to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID & PRIEST, L.L.P.

Dated: 4/21/05


Khaled Shami
Reg. No. 38,745

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 282-1855
Fax. (408) 287-8040